

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.0. 20x 1450
A Variation Viction 22313-1450

				•	
APPLICATION NO.	FILIN	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/717,026	11/1	9/2003	Jeff Scott Eder	VM-57	7325
53787	7590	12/01/2006		EXAM	INER ·
ASSET TR			•	HOLMES, M	IICHAEL B
2020 MALT SUITE 7362		•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
BOTHELL, WA 98021			2121		
				DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/717,026	EDER, JEFF SCOTT	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael B. Holmes	2121	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the d	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versillure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 At 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action for allower closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims	•		
 4) Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-27 is/are withdrawn 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 28-70 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	n from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2006 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	a) \boxtimes accepted or b) \square objected the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). sected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 08292006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite	

Application/Control Number: 10/717,026

Art Unit: 2121



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 - WWW.USPTO.GOV

Examiner's Detailed Office Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

- 2. The invention as disclosed in claims 28-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being non-statutory subject matter.
- 3. Claims 28-70 appears to be directed to an abstract idea rather than a practical application of an abstract idea which would produce a "useful, concrete or tangible results." Specifically, the claims involves disjointed concepts and ideas based in the abstract, all of which fails to provide a practical application and is insufficient to establish a real world "tangible" result.
- 4. Devoid of such, applicant's claimed invention is an abstract idea e.g., a computational model or a mathematical manipulation of a function or equation. A process that merely manipulates an abstract idea or performs a purely mathematical algorithm is non-statutory despite the fact that it might inherently have some usefulness. *see In re Sarkar*, 588 F.2d at 1335, 200 USPQ at 139, wherein the court explained why this approach must be followed:

No mathematical equation can be used, as a practical matter, without establishing and substituting values for the variables expressed therein. Substitution of values dictated by the formula has thus been viewed as a form of mathematical step. If the

Application/Control Number: 10/717,026

Art Unit: 2121

steps of gathering and substituting values were alone sufficient, every mathematical equation, formula, or algorithm having any practical use would be per se subject to patenting as a "process" under 101. Consideration of whether the substitution of specific values is enough to convert the disembodied ideas present in the formula into an embodiment of those ideas, or into an application of the formula, is foreclosed by the current state of the law.

Page 3

- 5. A claim is limited to a practical application when the method or system, as claimed, produces a concrete, tangible and useful result; i.e., the method recites a step or act of producing something that is concrete, tangible and useful. See AT &T, 172 F.3d at 1358, 50 USPQ2d at 1452. See MPEP § 2106(IV) The claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application. That is, it must produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." State Street, 149 F.3d at 1373, 47 USPQ2d at 1601-02. Remember, the claims define the property rights provided by a patent, and thus require careful scrutiny. Therefore, it is not enough to set forth invention in the specification. The claims must also reflect the scope and breath of applicant's invention. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551(CCPA 1969). The situation in this application appears to be more difficult since it does not appear that the practical application is contained within the specification.
- 6. Claim 60 is considered to be directed to a storage device having stored thereon a data structure e.g., functional descriptive material. However, the data structure e.g., functional descriptive material as claimed does not produce any tangible result that has a practical application. Merely manipulating data not tied to the real-world is not patent eligible subject matter, see In re Warmerdam, 31 USPQ2d, 1354.

Art Unit: 2121

Correspondence Information

7. Any inquires concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael B. Holmes, who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. or via telephone at (571) 272-3686 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3686 or email Michael.holmesb@uspto.gov.

If you need to send an Official facsimile transmission, please send it to (703) 746-7239.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful the Examiner's Supervisor, Anthony Knight, may be reached at (571) 272-3687.

Hand-delivered responses should be delivered to the Receptionist @ (Customer Service Window Randolph Building 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22313), located on the first floor of the south side of the Randolph Building.

Michael B. Holmes

Patent Examiner
Artificial Intelligence
Art Unit 2121

United States Department of Commerce Patent & Trademark Office

Wednesday, November 08, 2006

MBH